



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/653,411	653,411 08/31/2000		Whonchee Lee	M4065.0361/P361	5349
24998	7590	07/30/2003			
		IRO MORIN & C	EXAMINER		
2101 L STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20037-1526				NGUYEN, JOSEPH H	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2815	····
				DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory .	Action
------------	--------

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/653,411	LEE ET AL.	
Examin r	Art Unit	
Joseph Nguyen	2815	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 July 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a

conditi	ejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in on for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued nation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.
	PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]
b) [	event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)
have bee 37 CFR (b) above	ensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee en filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in e, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any partent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
1.	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a)	they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
٠,	they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
, ,	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d)	they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE:
	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.⊠	The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .
6.	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.🛛	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
	Claim(s) allowed:
	Claim(s) objected to:
	Claim(s) rejected: 39-51.
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
9.	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
10.	Other:
	EDDIE LEE

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

)

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Lee does not disclose the limitation of "at least one electro-mechanically polished metal layer". However, this limitation is merely product by process. The presence of process limitations on product claims, which product does not otherwise patentably distinguish over prior art, cannot impart patentability to the product. In re Stephens 145 USPQ 656 (CCPA 19650. Therefore, Lee discloses all the structures set forth in the claimed invention.